

Program 1 – Conservation Works Program Evaluation

Program Objective

This program provides funding for physical conservation works projects for State Heritage Register listed items or state significant heritage items

Overall program summary

58% of applications received were funded, of these 81% were successfully completed.

Overall \$7,667,462 was spent on heritage works through this program made up of \$1,877,410 grant funding and \$5,790,052 contributed by applicants.

The multiplier effect for the program was \$1:\$3

Evaluation

What do the KPIs tell you about these outcomes?

Overall, the program was a great success and achieved the stated program purpose.

What were the key results or achievements for the year?

- 100% of funded projects reported that the project was very successful or successful.
- 93% of projects reported significant improvement in the condition of the heritage item
- 95% of projects created paid employment
- > 79% applicants expectations were met or exceeded for customer service satisfaction

Were there any challenges or disappointments that had a major effect on your results?

For a number of individual reasons, there was a 30% drop-out rate for approved projects which was very high.

What will you do next year?

Continue to work closely with customers and projects, look to set up more information and forms on-line.

Outcome 1 - Improvement in the condition of heritage items

93% of projects reported significant improvement in the condition of the heritage item due to the project funding

Outcome 2 - Improvement in the management of heritage items

61% of funded projects reported significant improvement in the management of the heritage item

Outcome 3 - HIP funded projects are successfully completed

100% of funded projects reported that the project was very successful or successful in achieving the project aims

Stated reasons why projects were successfully completion:

- Use of good professionals and tradespeople, community input and interest,
- Heritage Branch funding received and assistance
- Support of council heritage advisors and officers

Stated reasons why projects were not successfully completed:

- Budget issues and insufficient funds
- Unforeseen extra costs, scope of works increased
- Overambitious project for allowed timing and budget

Outcome 4 - HIP funded projects positively contribute to heritage tourism

97% of completed projects reported that their project contributes to heritage tourism. This result exceeds the NSW Government result indicator of at least 70% of projects.

Feedback on contributions to heritage tourism include:

- “The property (Maitland Gaol) is operated as a commercial tourism business unit of Council with its prime purpose of presenting the historic and cultural nature of the site to the visiting public through tours and other sympathetic activities”.
- “The Roxy Theatre is a cinema and live theatre venue that attracts patrons from around regional NSW and interstate through its diverse program of events and films”.
- “The project returned the main street facades to the character of the early settlement/river town consistent with other community projects within the town/river port area”.

Outcome 5 - HIP funded projects created paid employment

95% of projects created paid employment, employing an average of 5 tradespeople and 1.5 heritage consultant per project.

Outcome 6 - HIP funded projects are actively supported by the community

57% of funded projects utilised volunteers to complete the project, with an average 1615 hours contributed by volunteers for each completed project.

Other forms of community involvement were:

- Fund raising and donations of materials
- Community project management
- Community awareness raising through festivals and newsletters,

70% of funded projects created media interest, with an average of 2 media items per project.

Outcome 7 - Satisfied HIP funded project applicants

Overall, more than 79% applicants expectations were met or exceeded in terms of customer service satisfaction with the funding program.

The Heritage Branch funding program could positively contribute to projects by:

- Publishing completed projects in newsletters
- Providing funding for future projects

Improvements to the Heritage Branch funding program include:

- Workshops on grant applications
 - More information on final invoicing and reports
 - More forms available on-line
 - Great as it is!
-

Program 1 – Conservation Works Program Evaluation Outcomes and Key Performance Indicators

Overall program results

58% of applications received were funded, of those funded, 81% were completed		121 applications received 70 projects funded 43 completed
HIP funding multiplier effect of 1:2.4	\$5,790,052 Applicant contribution to project \$1,877,410 HIP contribution to project	HIP funding on average provided 25% of project cost

Evaluation

58% of applications received were funded, of these 81% were successfully completed.

Overall \$7,667,462 was spent on heritage works through this program made up of \$1,877,410 grant funding and \$5,790,052 contributed by applicants.

The multiplier effect for the works program was \$1:\$2.4

Outcome 1

Improvement in the condition of heritage items

*This outcome measures the **improvement in the physical conservation** of State Heritage Register and state heritage items through HIP funding.*

Key Performance Indicator 1 – Improved condition of heritage item with HIP funding

HIP funding helped to <u>improve the condition</u> of my heritage item	1 (none)	0% of responses
	2 (a little)	0%
	3 (some)	7%
	4 (mostly)	50%
	5 (exceeded my expectations)	43%

Evaluation

93% of projects reported significant improvement in the condition of the heritage item due to the project funding

Outcome 2

Improvement in the management of heritage items

*This outcome measures the **improvement in the management** of State Heritage Register and state heritage items through use of Conservation Management Plans.*

Key Performance Indicator 2 – Conservation Management Plans improved the management of heritage item

Use of a CMP helped to <u>improve the management</u> of my heritage item	1 (none or not applicable)	23% of responses
	2 (a little)	3%
	3 (some)	13%

	4 (mostly)	52%
	5 (exceeded my expectations)	9%

Evaluation

61% of funded projects reported significant improvement in the management of the heritage item

Outcome 3

HIP funded projects are successfully completed

This outcome measures the successfully completed projects and their contribution to the conservation and management of State Heritage Register and state heritage items through HIP funded works projects, as assessed by the applicant.

Key Performance Indicator 3 – Successfully completed HIP funded projects

Yes , the project was <u>very successful</u> - we achieved everything we set out to	61% of total projects completed
Yes , the project was <u>mostly successful</u> - we achieved most of what we set out to do	39% of total projects completed
No , the project was <u>not successful</u> - we did not achieve what we set out to do	0 % of total projects completed

Evaluation

100% of funded projects reported that the project was very successful or successful in achieving the project aims

Stated reasons why projects were successfully completion:

- Use of good professionals and tradespeople, community input and interest,
- Heritage Branch funding received and assistance
- Support of council heritage advisors and officers

Stated reasons why projects were not successfully completed:

- Budget issues and insufficient funds
- Unforeseen extra costs, scope of works increased
- Overambitious project for allowed timing and budget

Outcome 4

HIP funded projects positively contribute to heritage tourism

This outcome measures the contribution to heritage tourism. Contribution to heritage tourism is defined as (open days, part of a heritage trail, part of a main street or heritage precinct or commercial heritage tourism venture).

(This is a NSW Government and Heritage Branch priority - Result indicator - At least 70% of funded projects to assist heritage tourism)

Key Performance Indicator 4 – HIP funded projects contributed to heritage tourism

Yes , my project <u>contributed</u> to heritage tourism	97% of projects completed
No , my project <u>didn't contribute</u> to heritage tourism	3% of projects completed

If yes, it contributed in the following ways:

Yes , my heritage property/item, was <u>open for public inspection</u> (eg Open Days for Heritage Festival, etc)	67.5% of project completed
Yes , my heritage property/item is part of a <u>local heritage trail</u> or interpretation walk around your area.	60% of projects completed
Yes , my heritage property/item is part of a <u>main street or town centre heritage precinct</u> .	42.5% of projects completed
Yes , my heritage property/item is a <u>commercial heritage tourism venture</u> – (eg Bed and Breakfast accommodation, or heritage tourism venture such as a gold mining site, etc)	10% of projects completed

Evaluation

97% of completed projects reported that their project contributes to heritage tourism. This result exceeds the NSW Government result indicator of at least 70% of projects.

Feedback on contributions to heritage tourism include:

- “The property (Maitland Gaol) is operated as a commercial tourism business unit of Council with its prime purpose of presenting the historic and cultural nature of the site to the visiting public through tours and other sympathetic activities”.
- “The Roxy Theatre is a cinema and live theatre venue that attracts patrons from around regional NSW and interstate through its diverse program of events and films”.
- “The project returned the main street facades to the character of the early settlement/river town consistent with other community projects within the town/river port area”.

Outcome 5

HIP funded projects created paid employment

This outcome measures the contribution to employment creation and increased trade and professional skills in heritage conservation.

(A NSW Government and Heritage Branch priority outcome.)

Key Performance Indicator 5 – Paid employment created by HIP funded projects

Yes , my project <u>created paid employment</u>	95% of projects completed
No , my project <u>did not create any employment</u>	5% of projects completed

If answered yes:

<u>Number and type of paid tradespeople employed on my</u>	208 tradespeople,
--	-------------------

project (eg roofer, plumber, carpenter and joiner, etc)	5 jobs per project
Number and type of paid professionals employed on my project (eg engineers, architects, etc)	64 professionals, 1.5 jobs per project

Evaluation

95% of projects created paid employment, employing an average of 5 tradespeople and 1.5 heritage consultant per project.

Outcome 6

HIP funded projects are actively supported by the community

This outcome measures active community support for HIP funded projects through volunteer hours and media coverage.

Key Performance Indicator 6 - Volunteer hours contributed to HIP funded projects

Yes , my project <u>created an opportunity for volunteers</u>	0% of projects completed
No , my project <u>did not create an opportunity for volunteers</u>	100% of projects completed

If yes,

Number of <u>volunteer hours</u> contributed to my project	69441+ volunteer hours, 1615 hours per project
--	---

Evaluation

57% of funded projects utilised volunteers to complete the project, with an average 1615 hours contributed by volunteers for each completed project.

Other forms of community involvement were:

- Fund raising and donations of materials
- Community project management
- Community awareness raising through festivals and newsletters,

Key Performance Indicator 7 – Media coverage for HIP funded projects

Yes , my project <u>created media interest and coverage</u> for my project (includes newspaper, radio, TV)	70% of projects completed
No , there was no <u>media interest or coverage</u> of my project	30% of projects completed

If yes,

Number of <u>media inquiries and media releases</u> for my project (includes newspaper, radio, TV)	90+ items of media coverage 2 items per project
--	--

Evaluation

70% of funded projects created media interest, with an average of 2 media items per project.

Outcome 7

Satisfied HIP funded project applicants

This outcome measures HIP funded project customer service satisfaction levels

Key Performance Indicator 8 - Customer service satisfaction

<u>Helpful assistance and advice</u> was provided to me for my HIP funding and project	1 (none) 2 (a little) 3 (some) 4 (mostly) 5 (exceeded my expectations)	0% of responses 2% 19% 43% 36%
The <u>Application Form</u> was easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy) 2 (a little) 3 (some) 4 (mostly) 5 (very easy to complete)	4% of responses 0% 4% 85% 7%
The project <u>payment claims</u> were easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy) 2 (a little) 3 (some) 4 (mostly) 5 (very easy to complete)	2% of responses 0% 5% 88% 5%
The project <u>final report</u> was easy to understand and complete	1 (not easy) 2 (a little) 3 (some) 4 (mostly) 5 (very easy to complete)	2.5% of responses 0% 5% 7.5% 85%

Evaluation

Overall, more than 79% applicants expectations were met or exceeded in terms of customer service satisfaction with the funding program.

The Heritage Branch funding program could positively contribute to projects by:

- Publishing completed projects in newsletters
- Providing funding for future projects

Improvements to the Heritage Branch funding program include:

- Workshops on grant applications
 - More information on final invoicing and reports
 - More forms available on-line
 - Great as it is!
-